UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/016,674	10/30/2001	Jay S. Dweck	G08.010	4007

28062 7590 01/13/2005

BUCKLEY, MASCHOFF, TALWALKAR LLC
5 ELM STREET
NEW CANAAN, CT 06840

EXAMINER	
CHOJNACKI, MELLISSA M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2164	

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/016,674	DWECK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Mellissa M Chojnacki	2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 August 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *26 and 37-53* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *26 and 37-53* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications filed on August 3, 2004, claims 1-25 and 27-36 are cancelled, claims 53 has been added. Therefore, claims 26 and 37-53 are presently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,739), in view of Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,434).

As to claim 37, Shirley et al. teaches assigning a first document tag to a document (See column 3, lines 15-28, where the "markup language tag" is read on "first document tag");

automatically assigning a second document tag to the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag (See column 3, lines 15-33, where the "query tag" is read on "second document tag" and "cross-reference tags " is read on "associated tag").

Shirley et al. dose not teach a computer-implemented method of facilitating access to documents; wherein the first document tag is associated with a first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; and wherein the second document tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure.

Anderson et al. teaches system and method for retrieving information from a database using an index of XML tags and metafiles (See Abstract), in which he teaches a computer-implemented method of facilitating access to documents (See abstract, where "access" is read on "retrieving"); wherein the first document tag is associated with a first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure (See abstract; column 2, lines 41-42, lines 53-65); and wherein the second document tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure (See abstract; column 2, lines 41-42, lines 53-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified Shirley et al., to include wherein the first document tag is associated with a first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; and wherein the second document tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Shirley et al., by the teachings of Anderson et al. because wherein the first document tag is associated with a first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; and wherein the

second document tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure would focus the search on the most relevant information, perform the search in the most efficient manner and support searching multiple databases (See Anderson et al., column 2, lines 27-30).

4. Claims 26, and 38-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over LaMarca et al. (U.S. Patent 6,266,682) in view of Shirley et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,739), and further in view of Anderson et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,434).

As to claim 26, LaMarca et al. teaches a computer-implemented method of facilitating access to investment research documents (See abstract, where "investment research document" is read on "documents"), comprising:

receiving an investment research document from a content publisher (See abstract, where "investment research document" is read on "document" and it is inherent that a "document" has a "publisher");

receiving an indication of a first document tag from the content publisher (See column 2, lines 53-55; column 7, lines 44-45, column 15, lines 18-19);

transmitting an indication of the associated tag to the content publisher (See column 2, lines 53-55);

receiving an indication from the content publisher (See column 2, lines 53-55; column 7, lines 44-45, column 15, lines 18-19);

transmitting the retrieved investment research document to a content reader via a communication network (See column 1, lines 45-51; where "user" is read on "content reader").

LaMarca et al. does not teach, wherein the first document tag is associated with first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag, wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; the indication indicting whether the automatically determined associated tag is appropriate; assigning a second document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and the received indication; retrieving the investment research document in accordance with the second document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (ii) a request tag, and (Iii) an entitlement tag.

Shirley et al. teaches a system that accesses a knowledge base by markup language tags (See Abstract), in which he teaches automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag (See column 3, lines 15-23, where the "markup language tag" is read on "first document tag" and "query tag" is read on "associated tag"); assigning a second document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and the received indication (See column 3, lines 15-33, where the "query tag" is read on "second document tag" and "cross-reference tags " is read on "associated tag"); retrieving the investment research document in accordance with the second document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag,

(ii) a request tag, and (Iii) an entitlement tag (See column 3, lines 15-23, where "a request tag" is read on "query tag").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al., to include automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag; assigning a second document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and the received indication; retrieving the investment research document in accordance with the second document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (ii) a request tag, and (Iii) an entitlement tag.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al., by the teachings of Shirley et al. because automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag; assigning a second document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and the received indication; retrieving the investment research document in accordance with the second document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (ii) a request tag, and (Iii) an entitlement tag would allow the manufacturer/publisher to retain some advantages of making documentation freely available, while retaining a significant quantity of "value added" features which can be exploited only by the manufacture/publisher itself (See Shirley et al., column 2, lines 37-52).

LaMarca et al. as modified, still dose not teach wherein the first document tag is associated with first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; the indication indicting whether the automatically determined associated tag is appropriate.

Anderson et al. teaches system and method for retrieving information from a database using an index of XML tags and metafiles (See Abstract), in which he teaches wherein the first document tag is associated with first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure (See abstract; column 2, lines 41-42, lines 53-65); wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure (See abstract; column 2, lines 41-42, lines 53-65); the indication indicting whether the automatically determined associated tag is appropriate (See column 15, lines 9-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, to include wherein the first document tag is associated with first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; the indication indicting whether the automatically determined associated tag is appropriate.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, by the teachings of Anderson et al. because wherein the first document tag is

associated with first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; the indication indicting whether the automatically determined associated tag is appropriate would focus the search on the most relevant information, perform the search in the most efficient manner and support searching multiple databases (See Anderson et al., column 2, lines 27-30).

As to claim 38, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein the received indication is associated with an acceptance by the content publisher of the automatically determined associated tag (See LaMarca et al., column 2, lines 53-55; column 7, lines 44-45, column 15, lines 18-19; also see Shirley et al., column 3, lines 15-23, where "knowledge base" is read on "content publisher").

As to claim 39, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein the second document tag comprises the automatically determined associated tag (See Shirley et al., column 3, lines 15-23, where the "markup language tag" for each document also has a associated "query tag").

As to claim 40, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein the investment research document comprises at least one of: (i) text information, (ii) image information, (iii) audio information, and (iv) executable information (See

LaMarca et al., column 11, lines 12-19; also see Shirley et al., column 1, lines 24-32, where "elements" is read on "content").

As to claim 41, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein the communication network comprises at least one of: (i) the Internet, (ii) an intranet, (iii) a public network, (iv) a public switched telephone network, (v) a proprietary network, (v) a wireless network, and (vi) a local area network (See LaMarca et al., column 1, lines 44-47; also see Shirley et al., column 4, lines 12-23).

As to claim 42, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein the investment research comprises at least one of (i) financial information, (ii) financial news, (iii) information about financial events, (iv) investment information, and (v) market information (See Anderson et al., column 2, lines 41-43, where "categories" and "terms" are read on "(i) financial information, (ii) financial news, (iii) information about financial events, (iv) investment information, and (v) market information"; also see column 7, lines 40-67).

As to claim 43, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein at least one of the tags is associated with at least one of: (i) an author, (ii) a date, and (iii) an information type (See LaMarca et al., column 10, lines 22-27, where "properties" is read on "tags"; also see Shirley et al., column 4, lines 44-50).

As to claim 44, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein at least one of the tags is associated with at least one of: (i) a sector, (ii) an industry, (iii) a research type, (iv) a company, (v) an issuer, (vi) a region, (vii) a country, (viii) an investment product, (ix) a security instrument, (x) a third-party rating, (xi) a research analyst, (xii) a strategist, (xiii) an event type, (xiv) a subject, (xv) an investment style, (xvi) a market cap, (xvii) a document type, (xviii) an information value, and (xix) a currency (See Anderson et al., column 2, lines 41-43, where "(i) a sector, (ii) an industry, (iii) a research type, (iv) a company, (v) an issuer, (vi) a region, (vii) a country, (viii) an investment product, (ix) a security instrument, (x) a third party rating, (xi) a research analyst, (xii) a strategist, (xiii) an event type, (xiv) a subject, (xv) an investment style, (xvi) a market cap, (xvii) a document type, (xviii) an information value, and (xix) a currency" are read on "categories" and "terms" ; also see column 7, lines 40-67).

As to claim 45, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein the first document tag comprises at least one of: (i) a primary tag, and (ii) a secondary tag (See Anderson et al., column 15, lines 62-63, where "first domain tag" reads on "primary tag").

As to claim 46, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein the rule is associated with at least one of (i) a start date, (ii) an end date, (iii) antecedent tags, (iv) descendant tags, and (v) sibling (See LaMarca et al., column 2, lines 4-6; column 3, lines 7-9)

As to claim 47, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein investment research document are received from a plurality of content publishers tags (See LaMarca et al, Abstract; column 1, lines 36-45).

As to claim 48, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein the transmitting is performed via at least one of (i) a content controller, (ii) a content reader, (iii) a personal computer, (iv) a server, (v) a portable computing device, (vi) a telephone, (vii) a Web site, and (viii) an electronic mail message (See LaMarca et al., column 1, lines 42-47).

As to claim 49, LaMarca et al. teaches an apparatus, comprising:

receive an investment research document from a content publisher (See abstract, where "investment research document" is read on "document" and it is inherent that a "document" has a "publisher");

receive an indication of a first document tag from the content publisher (See column 2, lines 53-55; column 7, lines 44-45, column 15, lines 18-19);

transmit an indication of the associated tag to the content publisher (See column 2, lines 53-55);

receive an indication from the content publisher (See column 2, lines 53-55; column 7, lines 44-45, column 15, lines 18-19); and

transmit the retrieved investment research document to a content reader via a communication network (See column 1, lines 45-51; where "user" is read on "content reader").

LaMarca et al. does not teach, a processor; and a storage device in communication with the processor and storing instructions adapted to be executed by the processor; wherein the first document tag is associated with first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; automatically determine an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag, wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; the indication indicting whether the automatically determined associated tag is appropriate; assign a second document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and the received indication; retrieve the investment research document in accordance with the second document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (iii) a request tag, and (iii) an entitlement tag.

Shirley et al. teaches a system that accesses a knowledge base by markup language tags (See Abstract), in which he teaches automatically determine an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag (See abstract; column 2, lines 41-42, lines 53-65); assign a second document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and the received indication (See column 3, lines 15-33, where the "query tag" is read on "second document tag" and "cross-reference tags " is read on "associated tag"); retrieve the investment research document in accordance

with the second document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (iii) a request tag, and (iii) an entitlement tag (See column 3, lines 15-23, where "a request tag" is read on "query tag").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al., to include automatically determine an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag; assign a second document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and the received indication; retrieve the investment research document in accordance with the second document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (iii) a request tag, and (iii) an entitlement tag.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al., by the teachings of Shirley et al. because automatically determine an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag; assign a second document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and the received indication; retrieve the investment research document in accordance with the second document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (iii) a request tag, and (iii) an entitlement tag would allow the manufacturer/publisher to retain some advantages of making documentation freely available, while retaining a significant quantity of "value added" features which can be exploited only by the manufacture/publisher itself (See Shirley et al., column 2, lines 37-52).

LaMarca et al. as modified, still dose not teach a processor; and a storage device in communication with the processor and storing instructions adapted to be executed by the processor; wherein the first document tag is associated with first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; the indication indicting whether the automatically determined associated tag is appropriate.

Anderson et al. teaches system and method for retrieving information from a database using an index of XML tags and metafiles (See Abstract), in which he teaches a processor (See column 4, lines 61-65; column 5, lines 5-9); and a storage device in communication with the processor and storing instructions adapted to be executed by the processor (See column 5, lines 5-30); wherein the first document tag is associated with first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure (See abstract; column 2, lines 41-42, lines 53-65); wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure (See abstract; column 2, lines 41-42, lines 53-65); the indication indicting whether the automatically determined associated tag is appropriate (See column 15, lines 9-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, to include a processor; and a storage device in communication with the processor and storing instructions adapted to be executed by the processor; wherein the first document tag is associated with first domain having a

single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; the indication indicting whether the automatically determined associated tag is appropriate.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, by the teachings of Anderson et al. because a processor; and a storage device in communication with the processor and storing instructions adapted to be executed by the processor; wherein the first document tag is associated with first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; the indication indicting whether the automatically determined associated tag is appropriate would focus the search on the most relevant information, perform the search in the most efficient manner and support searching multiple databases (See Anderson et al., column 2, lines 27-30).

As to claim 50, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches wherein the storage device further stores at least one of: (i) a tag database, (ii) a document database, and (iii) a tag association database (See Anderson et al., column 2, lines 36-42).

As to claim 51, LaMarca et al. as modified, teaches further comprising: a communication device coupled to the processor and adapted to communicate with at least one of: (i) a content publisher, (ii) a document storage device, (iii) a

content controller, (iv) a content reader, and (v) a payment service (See LaMarca et al., column 1, lines 42-47).

As to claim 52, LaMarca et al. teaches receiving an investment research document from a content publisher (See abstract, where "investment research document" is read on "document" and it is inherent that a "document" has a "publisher");

receiving an indication of a first document tag from the content publisher (See column 2, lines 53-55; column 7, lines 44-45, column 15, lines 18-19); transmitting an indication of the associated tag to the content publisher (See column 2, lines 53-55);

receiving an indication from the content publisher (See column 2, lines 53-55; column 7, lines 44-45, column 15, lines 18-19);

transmitting the retrieved investment research document to a content reader via a communication network (See column 1, lines 45-51; where "user" is read on "content reader").

LaMarca et al. does not teach, a medium storing instructions adapted to be executed by a processor to perform a method of facilitating access to documents; wherein the first document tag is associated with first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag, wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; the indication indicting

whether the automatically determined associated tag is appropriate; assigning a second document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and the received indication; retrieving the investment research document in accordance with the second document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (ii) a request tag, and (iii) an entitlement tag.

Shirley et al. teaches a system that accesses a knowledge base by markup language tags (See Abstract), in which he teaches automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag (See abstract; column 2, lines 41-42, lines 53-65); assigning a second document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and the received indication (See column 3, lines 15-33, where the "query tag" is read on "second document tag" and "cross-reference tags " is read on "associated tag"); retrieving the investment research document in accordance with the second document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (ii) a request tag, and (iii) an entitlement tag (See column 3, lines 15-23, where "a request tag" is read on "query tag").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al., to include automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag; assigning a second document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and the received indication; retrieving the investment research document in accordance with the

second document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (ii) a request tag, and (iii) an entitlement tag.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al., by the teachings of Shirley et al. because automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag; assigning a second document tag to the investment research document based on the associated tag and the received indication; retrieving the investment research document in accordance with the second document tag and at least one of: (i) a reader tag, (ii) a request tag, and (iii) an entitlement tag would allow the manufacturer/publisher to retain some advantages of making documentation freely available, while retaining a significant quantity of "value added" features which can be exploited only by the manufacture/publisher itself (See Shirley et al., column 2, lines 37-52).

LaMarca et al. as modified, still dose not teach a medium storing instructions adapted to be executed by a processor to perform a method of facilitating access to documents; wherein the first document tag is associated with first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; the indication indicting whether the automatically determined associated tag is appropriate.

Anderson et al. teaches system and method for retrieving information from a database using an index of XML tags and metafiles (See Abstract), in which he

teaches a medium storing instructions adapted to be executed by a processor to perform a method of facilitating access to documents (See column 4, lines 61-65; column 5, lines 5-30); wherein the first document tag is associated with first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure (See abstract; column 2, lines 41-42, lines 53-65); wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure (See abstract; column 2, lines 41-42, lines 53-65); the indication indicting whether the automatically determined associated tag is appropriate (See column 15, lines 9-12).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, to include a medium storing instructions adapted to be executed by a processor to perform a method of facilitating access to documents; wherein the first document tag is associated with first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; the indication indicting whether the automatically determined associated tag is appropriate.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, by the teachings of Anderson et al. because a medium storing instructions adapted to be executed by a processor to perform a method of facilitating access to documents; wherein the first document tag is associated with first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; wherein the associated tag is

associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; the indication indicting whether the automatically determined associated tag would focus the search on the most relevant information, perform the search in the most efficient manner and support searching multiple databases (See Anderson et al., column 2, lines 27-30).

As to claim 53, LaMarca et al. teaches a computer-implemented method of facilitating access to documents (See abstract), comprising:

receiving a first document tag to be assigned to a document (See column 2, lines 53-55; column 7, lines 44-45, column 15, lines 18-19),

transmitting an indication of the associated tag (See column 2, lines 53-55);

receiving an indication, the indication indicating whether the associated tag is if the associated tag is appropriate (See column 2, lines 53-55; column 7, lines 44-45; column 15, lines 18-19),

LaMarca et al. does not teach, wherein the first document tag is associated with a first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag, wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; assigning the associated tag to the document as a appropriate; and second document tag.

Shirley et al. teaches a system that accesses a knowledge base by markup language tags (See Abstract), in which he teaches automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag (See column 3, lines 15-23); assigning the associated tag to the document as a appropriate; and second document tag (See column 3, lines 15-23).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al., to include automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag; assigning the associated tag to the document as a appropriate; and second document tag.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al., by the teachings of Shirley et al. because automatically determining an associated tag for the document based on a rule associated with the first document tag; assigning the associated tag to the document as a appropriate; and second document tag would allow the manufacturer/publisher to retain some advantages of making documentation freely available, while retaining a significant quantity of "value added" features which can be exploited only by the manufacture/publisher itself (See Shirley et al., column 2, lines 37-52).

LaMarca et al. as modified, still dose not teach wherein the first document tag is associated with a first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data

structure; wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure

Anderson et al. teaches system and method for retrieving information from a database using an index of XML tags and metafiles (See Abstract), in which he teaches he teaches wherein the first document tag is associated with a first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure (See abstract; column 2, lines 41-42, lines 53-65); wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure (See abstract; column 2, lines 41-42, lines 53-65).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, to include wherein the first document tag is associated with a first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified LaMarca et al. as modified, by the teachings of Anderson et al. because wherein the first document tag is associated with a first domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure; wherein the associated tag is associated with a second domain having a single-rooted, hierarchical data structure would focus the search on the most relevant information, perform the search in the most efficient manner and support searching multiple databases (See Anderson et al., column 2, lines 27-30).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed on August 2, 2004, with respect to the rejected claims 26, and 37-53 have been fully considered but they are not found to be persuasive:

In response to applicants' arguments regarding independent claim 26, in which neither of the prior arts disclosed or suggest "automatically determining (or assigning) a second document tag". Shirley et al., teaches a knowledge base comprising of at least mark-up tag and a query (second) tag associated with each document (See abstract; column 3, lines 15-28).

In response to applicants' arguments regarding claims 26 and 38-53, in which neither of the prior arts disclosed or suggest "transmitting an indication of an associated tag, 'receiving an indication...indicating whether the...associated tag is appropriate, ' and 'assigning a second document tag based on the associated and received indication'". LaMarca et al. discloses the author assigning tags to his/her personal documents and is aware of all tags incorporated within his/her document because they have the opportunity to fix or change them at any time. (See column 2, lines 53-55).

Therefore, the claims stand rejected.

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mellissa M Chojnacki whose telephone number is (571) 272-4076. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached on (571) 272-4083. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Mmc
January 10, 2005

SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER